1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE
3	
4	
5	INQUIRY CONCERNING
6	FORMER JUDGE STEVEN C. BAILEY, CJP NO. 202
7	
8	
9	
10	CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT
11	
12	
13	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF
14	ORAL ARGUMENTS BEFORE COMMISSION
15	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
16	
17	Wednesday, January 30, 2019
18	
19	
20	REPORTED BY: CHARLOTTE A. MATHIAS, CSR 9792, RPR
21	
22	NOCELLE C ACCOCIANEC INC
23	UCCELLI & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1243 Mission Road South San Francisco CA 94080
24	South San Francisco, CA 94080 www.UccelliAssociates.com
25	E-mail: info@UccelliAssociates.com Tel: 650.952.0774 Fax: 650.952.8688

```
PARTICIPANTS:
 1
 2
 3
   COMMISSION MEMBERS:
 4
         NANCI E. NISHIMURA, ESQ., CHAIRPERSON
 5
         HON. MICHAEL B. HARPER, VICE-CHAIRPERSON
 6
         ANTHONY P. CAPOZZI, ESQ.
 7
         HON. WILLIAM S. DATO
 8
         MR. EDUARDO "EDDIE" DE LA RIVA
 9
         MS. SARAH KRUER JAGER
10
         MS. PATTYL A. KASPARIAN
11
         DR. MICHAEL A. MOODIAN
12
         MR. RICHARD SIMPSON
13
         MR. ADAM N. TORRES
         HON. ERICA R. YEW
14
15
16 RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL:
17
        JAMES A. MURPHY, ESQ.
18
        JANET L. EVERSON, ESQ.
19
        Murphy Pearson Bradley & Feeney
20
        San Francisco, CA
21
22 RESPONDENT:
23 HONORABLE STEVEN C. BAILEY
   SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
2.4
   COUNTY OF EL DORADO
25
```

```
1
   EXAMINERS:
 2
        MARK A. LIZARRAGA, ESQ., TRIAL COUNSEL
        SEI SHIMOGUCHI, ESQ., ASSISTANT TRIAL COUNSEL
 3
        BRADFORD BATTSON, ESQ., ASSISTANT TRIAL COUNSEL
 4
 5
        Office of Trial Counsel
 6
        Commission on Judicial Performance
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2019 1:34 P.M. 1 2 THE BAILIFF: All rise. The appearance before the Commission on Judicial Performance in the matter of 3 inquiry number 202 concerning former Judge Steven C. 5 Bailey is now in session. Please be seated. 6 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Good afternoon, ladies 7 and gentlemen. These are the public proceedings of 8 inquiry concerning former Judge Steve C. Bailey. I'm Nanci Nishimura, Chairperson of the Commission. 10 All Commission members are present. Any member 11 of the Commission may ask questions or otherwise 12 participate during these proceedings. Respondent Judge 13 Steven C. Bailey, formerly of the El Dorado County 14 Superior Court, is present with his counsel, James A. 15 Murphy and Janet L. Everson of San Francisco. The examiners for the Commission are trial 16 17 counsel, Mark A. Lizarraga and assistant trial counsels, 18 Sei Shimoquchi and Bradford Battson. 19 This is the time and place for the oral 20 argument pursuant to Commission Rule 132. Once the 21 argument is concluded and the matter is submitted, the 22 Commission will meet in closed session to deliberate. 23 The Commission's decision will be in writing 2.4 and it will be served on the parties and will be made public. 25

```
1
            Pursuant to Rule 136 of the Commission rules,
 2
   our decision will become final 30 days after it is
 3
           The respondent has the right to petition the
   California Supreme Court for review of the Commission's
 5
   determination.
            For the benefit of counsel for both sides and
 6
 7
   Judge Bailey, the members of the Commission have
   received the transcript of the evidentiary before the
 8
   Special Masters, as well as the report of the Special
10
   Masters and the parties' briefs. In making your
11
   arguments, please assume each Commissioner is familiar
12
   with the record and the issues presented by the briefs.
13
            We have scheduled one hour for oral argument.
   Each side is allotted 30 minutes. Judge Bailey is
15
   welcome to address the Commission as part of his
16
   30-minute presentation. The examiner will be heard
17
   first.
18
            Mr. Lizarraga you may proceed. Also, please
19
   advise if you would like to reserve any time of your 30
2.0
   minutes for rebuttal.
21
            MR. LIZARRAGA: Good afternoon. Once again, my
22
   name is Mark Lizarraga. I'm the examiner in this case.
23
   Madam Chairperson, I would like to reserve 10 minutes.
24
   May I proceed?
25
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Yes.
```

1 MR. LIZARRAGA: The examiners in this case 2 requested several additional fact-findings and canon 3 violations. Our requests are essentially uncontested with the exception of Count B, Count 2B, Count 2C, and 5 Count 4B. 6 So with regards to our request for additional 7 fact-findings and canon violations, since they're essentially uncontested, I'm going to submit them on the 8 briefs unless you all have questions for me, of course. 10 The examiners also made several objections to 11 the masters' findings. I cannot go into every single 12 one of those objections. I would like to highlight a 13 few things with regards to Count 3, Count 9 and the 14 aggravating factor, but I would first like to begin with 15 discipline. 16 So it is clear, the examiner is requesting that Judge Bailey be censured and barred. As this Commission 17 18 knows, it has identified several factors that are 19 relevant to determining an appropriate sanction. 20 extent of misconduct, prior discipline, demonstrated 21 appreciation of his conduct, likelihood of future 22 misconduct, impact of misconduct on the judicial system. 23 Again, I'm allotted 30 minutes. I can't go

into every single one of those, but I would like to

highlight a few of those. I would like to start off the

24

25

factor of the appreciation.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

If you look at Judge Bailey's responses to the Commission, his answer, his briefs to the Masters, he clearly has failed to recognize the impropriety of his acts. He has offered two defense theories. One of them -- or the initial one was the essentially the -the Commission members or the Commission's out to get him. He has indicated that the case is politically motivated. And he hasn't just said this in private. Не said it publicly. And his -- his accusation is equivalent to saying that the charges lack merit and that the body bringing these charges, because they're bringing them for political reasons, is basically dishonest.

And like I said, he didn't just say this in private. He went out in public and he amplified it by repeating it several times. And so I would like to play an excerpt of one of Judge Bailey's, you know, false accusations against the Commission. And this was from a radio show. It's -- the entire interview is in evidence. The transcript is also in evidence. So I'm going to play an excerpt, because I only have 30 minutes.

So I'm going to start at -- the first segment 25 is going to start at 2 hours, 6 minutes, and 26 seconds

```
1
   and it's going to go to 2 hours, 8 minutes, 44 seconds.
 2
   And this is Exhibit 21, the audio. The transcript is
   Exhibit 22.
 3
            (Playing of audio file.)
 4
 5
            MR. LIZARRAGA: And then the next excerpt is
   going to be from 2 hours, 10 minutes, 5 seconds to
 6
 7
   2 hours, 11 minutes, and 52 seconds. And again, that is
   Exhibit 21, that's the audio, and the transcript is
 8
   Exhibit 22.
10
            (Playing of audio file.)
11
            MR. LIZARRAGA: So that was his initial defense
12
   theory to sort of explain his predicament. He continued
13
   with that in his submissions in this case. And then he
14
   eventually started to abandoned it and adopted a new
15
   theory.
16
            And that new theory was that Judge Kingsbury
17
   was the cause of his problems. According to Judge
   Bailey, Judge Kingsbury felt threatened by him, that he
18
19
   inquired about how long she had been presiding judge out
20
   in El Dorado Superior Court. And because she felt
21
   threaten and had wanted to cling to this presiding judge
22
   title, she decided to essentially staff her minions
23
   throughout the courthouse to uncover things on Judge
24
   Bailey.
25
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA:
                                      Excuse me, sir.
```

```
1
   Mr. Anthony Capozzi has a question for you.
 2
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI:
                                   I have a question,
 3
   Mr. Lizarraga. How do you account for the charges in
   this case being filed two days before his candidacy was
 5
          Was that planned that way, or how did it happen?
   filed?
 6
            MR. LIZARRAGA:
                            It was just filed.
                                                As you
 7
   know, the investigation was a prolonged investigation.
   And the charges get filed when the notice gets approved.
 8
   And there's no nefarious conduct. I realize he's trying
   to draw an inference from that.
10
11
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI: But it was filed two
12
   days before his candidacy. There was no intent knowing
13
   that was going to happen two days later?
14
            MR. LIZARRAGA: No, Your Honor. I mean -- I
15
   mean -- that accusation to me is equivalent to saying
   the charges lack merit. And clearly the charges do not
16
17
   lack merit, because the Special Masters sustained 10 of
18
   11 counts.
19
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI: Do you consider the fact
20
   that he retired in August 31st, 2017, and he doesn't
21
   file his candidacy until February 26th, '18? Are you
22
   saying his conduct during that period of time after he
23
   retired?
2.4
            MR. LIZARRAGA:
                           No, no, no. We are alleging
25 misconduct through the time he's on the bench. I mean,
```

```
1
   we were -- go ahead. I'm sorry.
 2
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI: The other question I
 3
   have is you said his new theory is blaming Kingsbury.
            MR. LIZARRAGA: Right.
 4
 5
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI: In the Masters' report,
 6
   they were pretty clear there was animosity between the
 7
   two.
 8
            MR. LIZARRAGA: They indicate there was a toxic
   environment. But the toxic environment is not a
10
   mitigating factor. If you think about it, did the toxic
11
   environment cause any of the conduct here? I mean, did
12
   it cause him to make stereotyping remarks or cause him
13
   to accept gifts he wasn't supposed to accept or cause
14
   him to use his title and campaign throughout the state
   for office?
15
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI: Are you disagreeing with
16
17
   the Masters' findings in the first 6 counts?
18
            MR. LIZARRAGA: We -- we -- yes. We would --
19
   with some of the findings. We are asking for additional
   fact-findings. For example, in Count 2, Count 2B,
20
21
   Count 2C, they made no findings. So do you want me to
22
   list --
23
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI:
                                   It's a conduct question.
2.4
            MR. LIZARRAGA: There's various objections, and
25 most of those go to the level of misconduct that the
```

```
1
   Masters found. They found a number of improper action,
 2
   and we believe that those actually rise to the level of
 3
   appreciation of misconduct.
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI: All right. Thank you.
 4
 5
            MR. LIZARRAGA: So what those two theories
   demonstrate is that Judge Bailey essentially has no
 6
   self-awareness. He does not recognize his misconduct in
 7
   this case.
 8
 9
            And it's not just limited to those theories.
10
   don't have, you know, the time to go through every
11
   single one of the counts. But you'll notice in Judge
12
   Bailey's responses to the Commission, he's saying he
13
   disagrees. He says, no, that's not correct. I
14
   appreciate my -- I appreciate my misdeeds. I understand
15
   what I did wrong.
            But if you -- if you really closely examine his
16
17
   writings, he really does not have any appreciation for
18
   the improprieties of his acts. And I'm just going to
19
   list a couple.
20
            For example, in Count 6. If you recall,
21
   Count 6 was the gay tailor remark. So the Masters found
22
   that he made a remark -- stereotyping remarks about gay
23
         And they didn't give a lot of detail, but they
2.4
   made that particular conclusion.
25
            Now, this particular exhibit is in evidence.
```

It's Exhibit 236. And it's an email that was drafted by Suzanne Thurman who was one of the individuals that heard the gay tailor remark. And she drafted it when the facts were fresh in her mind, the same day she heard the comment.

2.4

So this is what she says, and I'm just reading an excerpts of it. You can take a look at Exhibit 236. She's saying this is what Judge Bailey said. I got -- he's referring to his clothes. Somebody made a comment, oh, you're very well together -- put together today or your clothes look a little bit odd. And this is his response.

"I got it in Paris or somewhere from a gay guy, so I know it's a nice shirt, as the gays only have nice clothes. And I know it goes together with what I'm wearing, because he picked it out, the whole thing, and gays really know how to dress."

So that's his -- that's his remark. Again, the Masters made a finding. Judge Bailey is saying, I fully appreciate, I'm fully aware of my misconduct. But take a look at what I said, take a look at his submissions prior to this hearing and if you look at his proposed findings of facts to the Masters.

So what happens is there is a hearing, and

1 after the hearing both sides, propose what they think 2 the findings of fact should be. This is Judge Bailey's 3 proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. Page 6 -- I'm sorry. This is Count 6, page 81. And I'm just reading excerpts of it. If you want to take a look 5 at it, it's the proposed findings of facts, page 81. 6 7 The statement was not about all gay men. there's a typo here. There are no factual basis to 8 claim that Judge Bailey made any stereotype statement. 10 Judge Bailey does not admit to making a remark that 11 perpetuates stereotypes. Well, you just heard me read 12 that exhibit. Clearly it's -- it's stereotyping 13 remarks. Clearly it's about gay men. 14 But even as of his proposed findings of fact, 15 he's saying it didn't happen. I didn't do it. 16 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Five minutes. 17 MR. LIZARRAGA: Five minutes. Wow. 18 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Yes, sir. There's a 19 question from Mr. Richard Simpson. 20 COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: I guess what I want to 21 understand is what weight are you suggesting be given to 22 Mr. Bailey's assertion that this is sort of a political 23 exercise? I'm not sure what you're saying -- suggesting 2.4 how we ought to consider that. Are you suggesting --25 for example, in the Masters' findings, they didn't find

willful misconduct on any of the counts.

2.0

2.4

And so are you suggesting that we ought to impose a higher level of discipline than we might otherwise without finding willful misconduct because he asserts this is a political exercise? I mean, I'm trying to understand why you're sharing and giving that such weight in your argument.

MR. LIZARRAGA: Okay. First, you don't need a finding of willful misconduct to censure a judge.

COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: I understand.

MR. LIZARRAGA: I indicated there are certain factors in Commission case law that the Commission has said we look at when we want to make a determination what's an appropriate sanction. So one of those factors is whether the judge demonstrates an acceptance of responsibility, whether he admits the misconduct or shows he understands what he did wrong. And so that is one factor for you to consider. And so I play that, and obviously I'm not going to have time to go through all of his other denials here. It's all in the paper.

But that is a demonstration that he is unwilling to acknowledge the impropriety and that it's not his fault. He's always looking for a scapegoat. It's either the Commission, it's Judge Kingsbury, or it's just like I said. I'm obviously not going to have

1 time to go through it. He just continuously denies that 2 he committed all these different allegations. And the 3 Masters have already sustained 10 out of 11. MR. LIZARRAGA: Am I at ten minutes? 4 5 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: You have 2 minutes. MR. LIZARRAGA: Two minutes. I'm going to have 6 7 to rely on the briefing. Another factor for you to consider is the extent of this misconduct. 8 I've already indicated the Masters sustained 10 out of 11 charges. 10 Several of the counts have multiple subparts. 11 For example, Count 9 had 25 subparts. And we 12 are asking that you make findings as to each one of 13 those just like you did in Judge Kreep. Judge Kreep, 14 like here, had 11 charges, 8 were sustained, yet the 15 Commission in its decision and order found he committed 16 29 acts of misconduct. How did you get to 29 out of 8 17 charges? Because they were multiple subparts just like 18 here. 19 Now, we had a notice with 60 charges, but for organizational purposes, we just grouped similar conduct 20 21 under one count. That doesn't mean he gets to benefit 22 and say, well, it's all under one count. Therefore, it should just be one act of misconduct. 23 2.4 Also, these multiple acts that he committed 25

were over an eight-year period. Unlike Judge Kreep

1 where some of the Commission members, if you recall that 2 questions was for me, that this was just conduct. 3 was pre-bench conduct. It was in his first year. has he done lately? 5 Well, here you have a broad sort of picture of who Judge Bailey is on the bench. You have eight and a 6 7 half years. Every year, he engaged in some kind of misconduct. And unlike Judge Kreep, he kind of started 8 out high and his misconduct started trailing off. Not a 10 whole lot, but a little bit, it started trailing off. 11 Judge Bailey's misconduct graph is the 12 opposite. He's consistent and then towards the end of 13 tenure on the bench, it ramps up. He's engaged in his 14 most serious misconduct, most egregious misconduct at 15 the end of tenure when you think he would be getting it. 16 He would be learning and he would improving his conduct, 17 but he absolutely was not. 18 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Mr. Lizarraga, it's 19 time. 20 MR. LIZARRAGA: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 MR. MURPHY: Madam Chair, Judge Bailey will 22 make the initial presentation and I will request 10 23 minutes. 2.4 All right. COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Thank you for the opportunity to 25 JUDGE BAILEY:

be here today to speak to this august body.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

I have been specifically asked to deal with the issue of the political nature of the proceedings and I want to do that. The political nature is really multiple-fold. Back -- as far back as 2012, the record is clear that there was significant hostility on our bench. Judges were being challenged in contested elections. The presiding judge and myself were on opposite sides of those elections. They were quite expensive for El Dorado County standards, running almost half a million dollars apiece. And not just expensive, but they were nasty and bitter.

And the initial sets of charges of the Commission began after those elections. In 2014, there were significant, mean and nasty elections. presiding judge on one side, myself on the other. 2016, there was a challenge against another sitting judge in the county. I opposed that sitting judge and the presiding judge supported him.

This -- the record is absolutely clear that Suzanne Kingsbury used her position and the staff and resources of the court to exact political retribution in that case.

But I think the real issue of politics is --25 there's no mystery. I ran for California Attorney

General in 2018. I was one of two voter-nominated 1 2 candidates for Attorney General. I happen to be a 3 Republican. There happened to be a Democrat whose preference or preferences were to the individual party. 5 But we're not nominated by our political parties we may be registered with. We are nominated by the voters of 6 California. 7 8 And prior to ever getting into that process, I reviewed the Constitution of the State of California. 10 looked at the case law that had been decided both on the 11 state and federal level. I looked at California's 12 process for running for nonjudicial and judicial office. 13 I reviewed the Chief Justice's video on judicial 14 fund-raising. 15 I came to the conclusion that the proper 16 process for running for nonjudicial office, looking 17 specifically at Article 6, Section 17, that makes it 18 permissive at or before the time that a declaration of 19 candidacy, a very specific document, is filed, a judge 20 may request and it's a permissive statute because the judge doesn't have to request that. 22 But it gives you certain additional rights in 23 terms of communicating with voters that you wouldn't 24 have if you remained an active sitting judge running for

25

a nonjudicial office.

The reason I bring these up is not to say that the decisions you're going to make today are whether you are going to say Judge Bailey did this or Judge Bailey did that, but the decisions on the First Amendment decisions that you're dealing with in this particular case. I think it is a case of first impression. The best I can tell, I'm the first sitting judge in the history of California, at least in the last probably 70 years -- I didn't go back further than 1950. But we never had a judge that actually files and runs for state office, statewide Constitutional office.

Before I made the final decision that I ought to do it, I did talk to people, just as the record reflects. I talked to people in Los Angeles County and San Diego and Orange. There was no mystery about the discussions that took place. Most of the discussions were in a private nature, going to somebody's office on my free time sitting down and talking to them to determine in advance whether there would be a possibility of running for the office and a probability that I could get elected to that office.

But having looked at the process, I realized that you can't do any of this first without having a certain amount of support. And secondly, without being in a position to raise money. As the Chief Justice says

in her video, judges are not prohibited from raising 1 2 money. So judges are, however, mandated to follow the 3 And the law in California requires that prior to 5 being able to raise money, you need to form a committee. You need either a judicial side or on the nonjudicial 6 side, you got to follow the same requirements. You need 7 to get a treasurer. You need to file the statement of 8 intention. That doesn't make you a candidate. 10 simply authorizes you under the Fair Political Practices 11 Act and California's Elections Code to go out and be 12 able to file. 13 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Judge Yew has a 14 question. 15 JUDGE BAILEY: Sure. 16 COMMISSIONER YEW: I'm sorry to interrupt. 17 taking us back to what you talked about earlier. 18 understand there are difficult relationships among 19 colleagues in a court setting or anywhere. And so to 20 what extent do you think someone else's conduct excuses 21 our own bad conduct or our own conduct? Because trying 22 to fit in what you are saying about Judge Kingsbury and, 23 you know, what the record has shown. 2.4 JUDGE BAILEY: I'm not suggesting that it

excuses an individual's conduct. I'm trying to describe

```
1
   the nature and the relationship and what was happening
 2
   on the El Dorado County bench at the time. And that's
 3
   it.
                                Okay. Thank you.
 4
            COMMISSIONER YEW:
 5
            JUDGE BAILEY:
                           Thank you. Any other?
 6
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA:
                                     Mr. Capozzi?
 7
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI: Why didn't you ask for
   another ethical opinion whether or not you could raise
 8
   money? You asked for ethics opinion on one of your --
10
   one of the counts here when sitting on the bench.
11
   didn't you ask for another ethics opinion?
12
            JUDGE BAILEY: Because it appeared clear in
13
   California statute that there was a process that you
14
   went through to be able to actually raise money.
15
   the Chief Justice says on her video that judges are
   permitted to raise money, that seemed -- and the law
16
17
   doesn't prohibit, just required that you follow a
   certain set of steps within California statutes.
18
19
            When you read the canons, Canon 5 doesn't have
20
   a prohibition against raising money by a sitting judge.
21
   So you have -- if you look at the canons and there's no
   prohibition, then what would you normally rely on but
22
23
   the state of the law?
2.4
            Now, that's not to say I didn't also consult
25 l
   with attorneys that were versed in public campaign law.
```

```
1
   I did.
           And, in fact, ultimately hired the firm of Bell,
 2
   McAndrews and Hiltachk that does campaign finance law.
 3
   I mean, that's their practice.
            COMMISSIONER CAPOZZI:
 4
                                    Thank you.
 5
            COMMISSIONER DATO: I have a question here.
 6
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Justice Dato has a
 7
   question.
 8
            COMMISSIONER DATO: Do I understand that you
   would disagree with Rothman's treatise with regard to
10
   the extent of activity a sitting judge can engage in
11
   prior or while still on the bench? Judge Rothman, as I
12
   think you know, talks about private planning activity as
13
   being something that can be done as long as it's done
14
   away from the courthouse.
15
            You seem to be articulating a different
16
   position. Am I correct?
17
            JUDGE BAILEY: No.
                                 I don't think I am
   articulating a different position. I didn't campaign
18
19
   out of the courthouse. I took time off. When I went to
20
   Southern California to talk to people, I was on my
21
   vacation time or I was on a weekend. I literally went
22
   as far away from my own courthouse as possible to ensure
23
   that I wouldn't have people who would come in front of
2.4
   me.
25
            You know, El Dorado County, South Lake Tahoe,
```

```
1
   El Dorado County doesn't get a lot of contact with
 2
   people in Orange County or San Diego or Riverside.
 3
            COMMISSIONER DATO: Okay. But am I correct
   that you were raising money?
 5
            JUDGE BAILEY: Absolutely. That's public
   record.
 6
 7
            COMMISSIONER DATO: And you believe that
   soliciting contributions and raising money falls within
 8
   the private planning?
10
            JUDGE BAILEY: I think it falls within the
11
   ambience of California's statutory scheme for campaigns.
12
            COMMISSIONER DATO: Okay. You don't see any
13
   ethical issues that that raises?
14
            JUDGE BAILEY: No. Not unless -- I don't see an
   ethical issue directly unless it's someone who would
15
   have a reason to come before the court, particularly
16
17
   when the statutory scheme that applies to sitting judges
18
   says you can go raise money.
19
            COMMISSIONER DATO: Okay. And you realize that
   at least people on your behalf were indicating that
20
21
   you -- naming you with your title indicating you were a
22
   candidate for Attorney General for 2018? And you don't
23
   view that as going beyond private planning.
2.4
            JUDGE BAILEY:
                           I don't. Because it's a
25
   third-party activity, and they have a political -- First
```

```
1
   Amendment political right to do that.
 2
            COMMISSIONER DATO:
                                 Okay.
 3
            JUDGE BAILEY: Respectfully, I understand that
   there can be some disagreement. But the fact of the
 5
   matter is, I think the statute is controlling and the
 6
   statute lays out a statutory scheme that we in
   California have adopted, the California legislature's
 7
   adopted, and they didn't put restrictions in the law
 8
   that singles judges out.
10
            COMMISSIONER DATO: But now it's correct -- am
11
   I correct? My understanding of the record is that with
12
   respect to your campaign committee and other people who
13
   were working on your behalf, you didn't take any steps
14
   to tell them not to use your title?
15
            JUDGE BAILEY:
                            I did not.
16
            COMMISSIONER DATO:
                                 Okay.
17
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: I have a question.
18
   Isn't it true in November 2016, you sought the advice of
19
   Former Judge Julie Conger, who was an expert on judicial
20
   ethics and she advised you that you should not
21
   distribute flyers including a photograph of you in your
22
         And she urged you to remove your judicial title
23
   from emails relating to your campaign, to avoid using
2.4
   the title in your campaign literature until after you
25
   took leave; is that correct?
```

```
JUDGE BAILEY: No. What I asked her is whether
 1
 2
   I could have -- whether a flyer with me in my judicial
 3
   robe was proper. She told me no. And we didn't
   distribute it. We destroyed that.
 5
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: She also advised you
   that you should take leave from the bench; is that
 6
 7
   correct?
 8
            JUDGE BAILEY: No.
 9
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: And you didn't do
   that. This is November 2016. You filed your intention
10
11
   in April of 2017; correct?
12
            JUDGE BAILEY: We filed a notice of intention
13
   in April of 2017.
14
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: There's a question for
15 l
   Mr. Richard Simpson.
            COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: The context of the
16
17
   comments that you have made are that the
18
   campaign-related activities prior to your resigning from
19
   the bench, in your view, aren't considered misconduct in
20
   the first place?
            JUDGE BAILEY: That's correct. I think that's
21
22
   correct.
23
            COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: I want to make sure I
24
   got the bottom line.
25
            JUDGE BAILEY:
                           Sure.
```

1 COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: I understand you. Thank 2 you. 3 JUDGE BAILEY: I think that's an important And I understand, you know, how distant I am 5 from where the examiner is. The reason -- and even the But the reason that's very important is, you 6 Masters. know, it isn't reasonable to expect that you can go to 7 the date that the Constitution requires or gives you 8 permission to take a leave of absence and assume that on 10 that particular day, all of a sudden you take a leave 11 the absence and begin to run for public office. 12 Now, you can say -- you can look back and say, 13 oh, Judge Bailey should have -- you know, that should 14 have just jumped right out at him. I suggest to you 15 that a decision that you make is going to impact every 16 judge forward that may wish to run for, say, district 17 attorney, Bonnie Dumanis, for example, or Rackauckas, or 18 Zellerbach, or any of the other people who have been 19 sitting judges at the time they run. 20 It's not realistic to assume that they waited 21 until the day they can file without talking to anyone, 22 without going out and trying to find out whether they 23 would have support. I didn't do that either. I looked 24 to people. I talked to people. I suggested to people

25

that I was thinking and/or others suggested I was going

```
1
   to run. I admit that.
 2
            But I think it's permitted under the California
 3
   statutory scheme. And I don't think it's prohibited
   under the way the canons were written.
 5
            COMMISSIONER SIMPSON:
                                   Thank you.
 6
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Judge Michael Harper
 7
   has a question.
 8
            COMMISSIONER HARPER: I'm just curious on the
   Attorney Clark issue.
10
            JUDGE BAILEY: Sure.
11
            COMMISSIONER HARPER: You were clearly friends
12
   with Mr. Clark. And you initiated at his wedding, went
13
   golfing.
14
            When you appointed him as a special master, why
15
   did you feel you didn't need to disclose that
16
   relationship?
17
            JUDGE BAILEY: Because it was an informal
   relationship. I was the bar president for roughly --
18
19
   well, about two years.
20
            COMMISSIONER HARPER: An informal relationship
   with your friendship with him or the appointment?
22
            JUDGE BAILEY: No. I knew him. I knew all the
23
   attorneys in El Dorado County.
2.4
            COMMISSIONER HARPER: Don't judges have an
25 ethical obligation to disclose that when you're
```

appointing an attorney on a case at \$350 an hour? Why 1 2 didn't you feel you needed to disclose that? I 3 understand you thought you didn't need to. But do you think you still had an obligation to disclose that 5 friendship? 6 JUDGE BAILEY: I don't know. At this point, 7 you know, that probably would have been the safe way to But at the time, it -- because I knew every 8 do it. lawyer, having dealt with all of those lawyers. 10 in South Lake Tahoe. What I was looking for in the 11 Clark matter, because the nature of the litigation and 12 how the attorneys were, one, taking up significant court 13 time over issues that were difficult to ferret out what 14 the actual dispute was. That's why we appointed Clark. 15 Now, he was on a list of discovery referees, as was Dave Bellick, and a number of other lawyers from the 16 17 Placerville area. We have some lawyers outside of South Lake Tahoe who were also on our discovery referee list. 18 19 But in my opinion, the lawyers in South Lake 2.0 Tahoe had become corrupted because there was too much 21 discussion over this particular issue in South Lake 22 Tahoe. So it was advisable to go find a lawyer outside 23 of Tahoe. Clark was one. He -- obviously, I knew who 2.4 I knew Dave Bellick and I knew the other 25 lawyers on the list in Placerville. We had practiced

```
1
   together.
              We knew each other.
 2
            But just knowing him didn't to me rise to that
 3
           That particular individual, you know, being at a
   point where I thought it was -- you know, the
 5
   relationship was too close and would require disclosure
   at that time.
 6
 7
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Two minutes, Your
 8
   Honor.
 9
            COMMISSIONER HARPER:
                                  Thank you.
10
            JUDGE BAILEY: I'm done.
11
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: I have one question
12
   for you. In your opening remarks, you characterize this
13
   as political in nature and this is in retaliation. And
14
   you named the judges who you thought were out to get
15
         But you also referred to the purported political
   makeup of this Commission, although you characterized it
16
17
   as this august body. Are you suggesting that the
   Commission is out to retaliate against you for political
18
19
   reasons?
20
            JUDGE BAILEY: I'm not suggesting that.
21
   in, you know, the height of a political campaign, when
   the Commission staff, when you guys, you know, get
22
23
   the -- get to take the heat, I guess, for actions of the
24
   Commission staff two days before filing, they file an
25
   accusation based on conduct that was at that point over
```

six months old, if it even is occurring, nothing --1 2 there was almost no action other than letters from the 3 Commission staff up until I announced I was going to retire. And then all of a sudden, it went into 5 hyperspeed. 6 And I retired at the end of August, immediately 7 announced I was going to run for Attorney General in early September. And then roughly -- not quite six 8 months, but almost six months later, they file the 10 accusation. Again, two days before I'm going to file. 11 How do you perceive it? Do you think it sounds 12 political? 13 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: I'm asking you the 14 question. 15 JUDGE BAILEY: Yeah. I think it sounds very 16 political. 17 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Thank you for your time. Oh. Ms. Pattyl has a quick question. 18 19 COMMISSIONER KASPARIAN: Of the 11 counts of 20 alleged misconduct, which one are you the most surprised 21 with and which one of the positions most disappoints 22 you? 23 JUDGE BAILEY: Frankly, I don't know that I'm 24 surprised or disappointed with any of the counts that 25 were brought. The facts are what the facts are.

1 I'm most concerned, I will tell you, is any findings 2 that you ultimately decide to make on the issue of 3 judges running for nonjudicial office, I think it really needs to be considered. 5 You know, frankly, I would encourage you to be absolutely narrow in any finding you make, because if 6 7 you're not narrow, you will impact any other judge, good, bad, indifferent, people you support, don't 8 support, you know think out to run in the first place. 10 But -- there is a -- you know, it's a Mack truck waiting 11 to go through that opening. 12 And I think from my perspective, I looked at 13 our United States Supreme Court decisions, as I 14 mentioned, I also looked at the California case law, and 15 I looked at the California statutory scheme, compared it 16 to the canons, and I believe that I was on solid legal 17 ground when I made the decision to run for California 18 Attorney General and in the manner that I did run for 19 California Attorney General. 20 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Thank you. 21 Mr. Murphy, you can relinquish some time for further questions to Mr. Bailey, or you have eight minutes. 22 23 MR. MURPHY: There are a few points I would 2.4 like to make. 25 First of all, I listened to Mr. Lizarraga and

1 I'm sure he's not trying to mislead the Commission, but 2 he played this transcript of the Phil Cowan interview of 3 Judge Bailey. And he gave it a broad brush approach, this is how Judge Bailey viewed the Commission. Well, 5 the question was relating to CHI and how he perceived CHI and the allegations of the Commission that he was 6 7 personally profiting by the referrals of this SCRAM devices to CHI. That's what this transcript is about. 8 9 Mr. Cowan says misusing his position on the 10 bench for personal profit. And then Judge Bailey talks 11 about CHI and how he obtained an ethics opinion before 12 he even referred any matters to CHI. So we're not 13 talking about this theory that somehow everything the 14 Commission has done was politically motivated. Which 15 raises the next issue, which is what Madam Chair said 16 about the perception. 17 Well, if you look at CCP Section 170.1, when a 18 judge is disqualified as an objective person knowing the 19 facts would include a judge not be fair and impartial. 20 It's a perception issue. It's an optic issue as my 21 children say. And that's the problem here. It is a 22 perception issue. And he's being criticized for raising that issue. 23 2.4 The other point I wanted to make is that in

connection with these activities in campaigning for

```
1
   political office.
                      That was never from anyone.
 2
   Bailey was exploring a campaign for Attorney General and
 3
   engaging campaign activities as the Special Masters
   found back in 2017. But the question here is not
 5
   whether he was campaigning or engaging in exploratory
   campaign.
 6
              The question under Canon 5 is personally
   prohibiting personally soliciting funds for the
 7
   political organization or nonjudicial candidate or
 8
   making speeches for a nonjudicial candidate.
            What's a candidate? It's not defined in the
10
11
           Candidate for judicial office is, but a
12
   candidate is not. And what Judge Bailey did before he
13
   decided to run for attorney general was within the
14
   Constitution. He researched the law, looked at the
15
   canons, review the Elections Code, and he correctly
16
   determined that a person becomes a candidate when they
17
   file a declaration of candidacy, which he did in 2018
   after he had retired from the bench.
18
19
            And I submit this canon at best is ambiguous.
   But if we read it literally, he was not a candidate for
20
21
   nonjudicial office until 2018. A couple of additional
22
   points --
23
            COMMISSIONER DATO:
                                 I have a question on that.
2.4
            MR. MURPHY: Certainly.
25
            COMMISSIONER DATO: This goes to the question I
```

asked of Judge Bailey. He said he did not disagree with 1 2 Judge Rothman with regard to that dividing line of what 3 you can do before you leave the bench and what you can do after in terms of being a candidate for nonjudicial 5 office. Yet you seem to be saying as long as you are not an officially declared candidate, there are no 6 7 limitations on your filing. Do I understand you correctly or not? 8 MR. MURPHY: Well, that's not quite as broad as 9 10 I would have put it. 11 I think what Rothman is talking about, and I 12 don't share his view, there are activities that a judge 13 could engage in that would violate other canons, but not 14 Canon 5. And I think in a campaign -- an exploratory 15 campaign, informing the obligation required of the 16 Elections Code for the Fair Political Practices Act and 17 statute establishing campaign and soliciting money, I 18 don't think those are the types of activities that are 19 directly addressed by Canon 5. And certainly he did not 20 violate Canon 2, the exploratory campaign. 21 The question is, was he a candidate? Because 22 that's what Canon 5 addresses. A candidate for 23 nonjudicial office. 2.4 COMMISSIONER DATO: Again, you define that by 25 l reference to filing a candidacy statement; am I correct?

```
1
            MR. MURPHY: Under the Elections Code, that's
 2
   when you become a candidate.
            COMMISSIONER DATO: So under that view, you can
 3
   refer to yourself as a candidate. Other people who are
 5
   working with you can refer to yourself as a candidate.
   You can solicit donations. None of that makes you a
 6
   candidate. It's only filing the statement.
 7
                                                 Is that
   what you're saying?
 8
 9
            MR. MURPHY: That's what I'm saying.
10
            COMMISSIONER DATO:
                                 Okay.
11
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Mr. Murphy, three
12
   minutes.
13
            MR. MURPHY: Thank you. Two quick points.
14
   Mr. Lizarraga said that there is this new theory
15
   involving Judge Kingsbury. Well, I have been
16
   representing Judge Bailey from day one. And the first
17
   theory that we defended the case on was Judge Kingsbury
18
   and Judge Bailey were at odds were one another.
19
   weren't any issues with respect to political campaign
20
   when the initial preliminary investigation was issued in
21
   this case. So that's not a new theory. That's the
22
   theory we had from the very beginning.
23
            It's when Judge Bailey decided to engage in
24
   exploratory campaign and campaign for Attorney General
25 l
   that the First Amendment and political issues arose.
```

1 The thing that's most noticeable about Judge Bailey's 2 activities and what the Special Masters found was that 3 none of the conduct that they found was a violation of the rules or canons involving conduct in the courthouse 5 or his performance of job duties as a judge. He didn't abuse the judicial power. There's no question about his 6 7 fairness and impartiality as a judge. There was no question regarding his honesty in discharging his 8 judicial duties and no issue of contempt or abuse or 10 anything else. 11 If you look at the decisions of the Commission 12 on censure, all of those involve willful misconduct or 13 abuse in the courthouse. And we have an absence here. 14 And I submit that the discipline shouldn't be a censure, 15 but public admonishment. Thank you. 16 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Mr. Lizarraga? 17 MR. LIZARRAGA: I'm going to have to bounce around, so forgive me. These are Exhibits 78 and 18 19 Exhibit 79, but, you know, I'm going to try to do this 20 as quickly as possible. 21 But Mr. Murphy said, you know, blaming Judge 22 Kingsbury has not been a new theory in representing 23 Mr. -- Judge Bailey for X number of years. Well, just 2.4 look at his submissions. Look at his answer. Look at

his responses to the Commission. Look at his briefs to

1 the Special Masters. And then look at his briefing 2 after the hearing. Clearly this is a new theory. 3 Judge Bailey says that he made the decision that he became a candidate by looking at the 5 Constitution, Article 6. We explained this, you know, in the briefs. Nothing in -- in Article 6 defines 6 7 candidate. It talks about when somebody becomes eligible for election. 8 9 Mr. Murphy just said that Judge Bailey did not become a candidate until 2018. Well, if you look at 10 11 Counts 7, 9, 10, and 11, between August of 2016 and 12 August of 2017, Judge Bailey was going up and down the 13 state telling everyone he was a candidate and he hadn't 14 filed his declaration of candidacy yet until 2018. And 15 you can see by these exhibits, he's using his title, he's saying he's a candidate, and he's asking for money 16 17 for his Attorney General campaign. 18 There's no additional conditional language 19 He's not saying I'm thinking about becoming a 20 candidate. I'm potentially a candidate. This is an 21 exploratory campaign. He's declaring himself a 22 candidate 15, 16 months before he ever files his 23 declaration of candidacy. 2.4 He says this is an issue of first impression. 25 l I'm not really sure what he means by that. There's a

Zellerbach case that's right on point. What I find interesting in Judge Bailey's opening brief and reply brief to this Commission, he never mentions Zellerbach. He just completely ignores the case. The case is right on point with regards to Canon 2.B(2) using your title for your personal interest. And it clearly states that a judge -- when a sitting judge comes back on the bench, the judge cannot use his or her title to benefit. You have the facts of the case? Judge Zellerbach was on leave of absence. He comes back. Uses his title to retire a nonjudicial office campaign debt.

The Commission is very clear. You can't do that. So when he comes before you and says this is an issue of first impression, clearly he did not read the Zellerbach case that came out in 2010, six years before he went and embarked on this exploratory actual campaign.

He says he spoke to people. Well, he spoke to Judge Conger, and she clearly told him not to engage in the conduct he eventually engaged in. He testified -- I know what his lawyers are saying now. They're making these legal arguments. But look at his testimony under oath. He testified over two days. He's not saying the things he just said before you now. You can look at his testimony, like I said.

Look at page 956. And what he's telling you at 956 is the, quote, research he did is he read Judge Rothman's handbook extensively. That's his words. And he says, and I'll try to read this quickly, but I gave you the page so you can take a look at it. And so I reviewed that.

And, of course, it compares it to the canons.

And so I compared it to the canons. Look at activities that I was involved in, concluded that in my estimation after looking at it that the types of things, talking to people, letting them know I might be interested in running, and I'm interested in their opinions, and whether they would be willing to support me. And those types of things were permitted.

So based on his reading of Rothman -- and this is his testimony under oath at trial. Based on his reading of Rothman, based on him examining the canons, he believed he could engage in this conduct.

What's interesting is he's very vague about Rothman. He doesn't say what he read. He doesn't say what section he read it in. He didn't say what page he was on. And if you look at Rothman, clearly there's nothing in Rothman that says that a judge -- a sitting judge can use his or her title to promote their political campaign for a partisan office. There's

nothing remotely like that.

25 l

So, you know, when he comes in here and tells you he did all this research, take a look at his testimony under oath. I think what he's saying now before you should be viewed with a high amount of skepticism.

He said -- he sort of touched on this. He said he was just talking to people. Look at these exhibits and there are too many to list. But you have all of them. He's not just talking to people. He is clearly -- as you can see in these exhibits, he's requesting monetary donations in his name for his campaign.

He says that he spoke -- or he said that he -I believe it was that he listened to a video that the
Chief Justice talked about lawyers can raise money. I
think he was kind of vague about that. He's not exactly
saying what he listened to. But I'm quite sure that the
Chief Justice was talking about raising money in a
judicial campaign and not for a nonjudicial partisan
office.

He said that there's nothing in the canons that say you cannot raise money for a nonjudicial office.

Take a look at Canon 5.A(3), what he was charged with, what the Masters found. It clearly has a personal

solicitation prohibition in there, similar to many other jurisdictions. And it says that a judge or a candidate cannot personally solicit contributions for a nonjudicial candidate, which is what he was.

He indicated that he never did any of this on the premises of the courthouse. He was never charged with necessarily doing the campaigning on the courthouse. But -- but so it's clear, he is actively campaigning throughout California while he is a sitting judge in El Dorado County. Doesn't matter if it was on his day off or that he took a sick day or annual leave. He was campaigning while he's a sitting judge and that's significant.

Finally, this is one of the factors that you are supposed to look at in determining an appropriate sanction under policy declaration 7.1. Whether the conduct was done knowingly and intentionally. And clearly, there's evidence here that Judge Bailey engaged in this conduct intentionally.

Again, he spoke with Judge Conger. Judge

Conger put him on notice that he was not supposed to do

the various things that he did. Yet he completely

rejected her advice and went ahead used his title and

campaigned. In his arguments to this Commission, he

says that he reviewed the canons and understood what

they prohibited, but thought they were unconstitutional 1 2 as applied to him. 3 Clearly what he's telling you is I knew what the canon restricted, but I thought it was unfair or 5 unconstitutional, so I went ahead and did it anyways. So take a look at Judge Conger's testimony and in his 6 own language. He is clearly acting knowingly and 7 intentionally when he's using his title and he's 8 campaigning. 10 COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: Mr. Richard Simpson. 11 COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: Mr. Lizarraga, you think 12 we should make a finding that some of these 13 campaign-related activity was willful conduct as well as 14 prejudicial conduct? 15 MR. LIZARRAGA: No. No, I'm not. I agree with the Special Masters' findings that this conduct rose to 16 17 the level of prejudicial misconduct. The only thing I 18 objected to is -- well, actually, I didn't object to it. 19 I asked for an additional finding by the Commission 20 because for organizational purposes, we put the campaign 21 under Count 9, one count, but there are 25 subparts to 22 that, and we are asking you to make prejudicial 23 misconduct findings as to each of those subcounts. 24 Because for the most part, they're on different days,

they're different locations, they're different

25

```
activities that he's involved in that he's violating the
 1
 2
   canons.
 3
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: One minute.
            MR. LIZARRAGA: So he's asking for the benefit
 4
 5
   because it's under one count, he should just get one
   count of misconduct. You didn't do that in Kreep.
   There is no reason to do it here.
 7
 8
            So if there are no further questions, I'm going
   to submit it. Thank you.
10
            COMMISSIONER NISHIMURA: We'll take it under
11
   submission.
12
            THE BAILIFF: Please remain seated and just
13
   come to order as the Commission members exit the
14
   courtroom.
15
             (Whereupon, the proceedings were
16
             adjourned at 2:40 p.m.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, Charlotte A. Mathias, Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify the foregoing pages 1 through 43 are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes taken in the above-entitled matter on: DATE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1/30/2019 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 14th day of February, 2019. CHARLOTTE A. MATHIAS, CSR 9792, RPR State of California

VELOVIEV 2 IVANS
\$
\$350 28:1
1
1 44:5
1/30/2019 44:8
1:34 4:1
10 5:23 8:6 9:17 15:3,9 16:22 37:11
11 8:7 9:18 15:3,9,14
30:19 37:11
1243 1:23
132 4:20
136 5:1
14th 44:10
15 37:22
16 37:22
17 18:17
170.1 32:17
18 9:21
1950 19:9
2
2 7:25 8:1,6,7 10:20 15:5 34:20
2.B(2 38:5
2:40 43:16
2010 38:15
2012 17:5
2014 17:14
2016 17:17 24:18 25:10
37:11
2017 9:20 25:11,13 33:4
37:12
2018 18:1 23:22 33:17,21 37:10,14
2019 1:17 4:1 44:10
1

PT OF ORAL ARGUMENT 0	1-30-2019 1 of 14
236 12:1,7	8 8:1 15:14,16
25 15:11 42:21	81 13:4,6
26 7:25	
26th 9:21	9
29 15:16	9 6:13 15:11 37:11 42:21
2B 6:4 10:20	94080 1:23
2C 6:4 10:21	956 39:1,2
	9792 1:20 44:14
3	
3 6:13	А
30 1:17 4:1 5:2,14,19 6:23 7:22	abandoned 8:14
30-minute 5:16	able 20:5,12 21:14
31st 9:20	above-entitled 44:7
	absence 26:9,11 36:13
4	38:10
43 44:5	absolutely 16:17 17:20 23:5 31:6
44 8:1	abuse 36:6,9,13
4B 6:5	accept 10:13
	acceptance 14:15
5 8:6 21:19 33:6	According 8:17
34:14,19,22	account 9:3
5.A(3 40:24	accurate 44:5
52 8:7	accusation 7:10 9:15
	29:25 30:10
6 6 7:25 10:17 11:20,21	accusations 7:19
13:4 18:17 37:5,6	acknowledge 14:22
60 15:19	act 15:23 20:11 34:16
650.952.0774 1:25	acting 42:7
650.952.8688 1:25	action 11:1 30:2
	actions 29:23
7	active 18:24
7 37:11	<pre>actively 41:8</pre>
7.1 41:16	activities 25:18 32:25
70 19:8	33:3 34:12,18 36:2 39:8 43:1
78 36:18	activity 22:10,12 23:25
79 36:19	42:13
8	acts 7:5 11:18 15:16,24

202 1:6 4:4

21 8:2,8 **22** 8:3,9

actual 28:14 38:16 actually 11:2 19:10 21:14 42:18 **ADAM** 2:13 **additional** 6:2,6 10:19 18:22 33:21 37:18 42:19 address 5:15 addressed 34:19 addresses 34:22 adjourned 43:16 admit 13:10 27:1 **admits** 14:16 admonishment 36:15 adopted 8:14 24:7,8 advance 19:19 **advice** 24:18 41:23 advisable 28:22 advise 5:19 advised 24:20 25:5 **afternoon** 4:6 5:21 **against** 7:19 17:17 21:20 29:18 aggravating 6:14 ahead 10:1 41:23 42:5 allegations 15:2 32:6 alleged 30:20 alleging 9:24 **allotted** 5:14 6:23 **already** 15:3,8 **am** 15:4 22:16,17 23:3 24:10 26:4 34:25 ambience 23:11 ambiguous 33:19 **Amendment** 19:4 24:1 35:25 among 20:18 amount 19:24 40:5

and/or 26:25 Angeles 19:14 animosity 10:6 announced 30:3,7 annual 41:11 answer 7:3 36:24 Anthony 2:6 9:1 anyone 26:21 33:1 anything 36:10 anyways 42:5 anywhere 20:19 **apiece** 17:11 appearance 4:2 appeared 21:12 applied 42:2 applies 23:17 appointed 27:14 28:14 appointing 28:1 appointment 27:21 **appreciate** 11:14 12:21 appreciation 6:21 7:1 11:3,17 approach 32:3 **appropriate** 6:19 14:14 41:15 approved 9:8 **April** 25:11,13 **area** 28:17 aren't 25:19 **argument** 4:20,21 5:13 14:7 **arguments** 1:14 5:11 38:22 41:24 **arose** 35:25 **Article** 18:17 37:5,6 articulating 22:15,18 assertion 13:22

assistant 3:3,4 4:17 **ASSOCIATES** 1:22 **assume** 5:11 26:9,20 **attorney** 17:25 18:2 23:22 26:17 27:9 28:1 30:7 31:18,19 33:2,13 35:24 37:17 attorneys 21:25 27:23 28:12 **audio** 8:2,4,8,10 august 9:20 17:1 29:17 30:6 37:11,12 authorizes 20:10 avoid 24:23 aware 12:21 away 22:14,22

bad 20:21 31:8 **Bailey** 1:5 2:23 4:5,8,13 5:7,14 6:17 8:18,24 11:6 12:8,20 13:9,10 16:6,21,25 19:3 20:15,24 21:5,12 22:17 23:5,10,14,24 24:3,15 25:1,8,12,21,25 26:3,13 27:10,17,22 28:6 29:10,20 30:15,23 31:22 32:3,4,10 33:2,12 34:1 35:16,18,23 36:23 37:3,9,12 41:18 Bailey's 7:2,18 11:12 13:2,22 16:11 36:1 38:2 **BAILIFF** 4:2 43:12 bar 27:18 barred 6:17 based 29:25 39:15,16,17 basically 7:13 **basis** 13:8 Battson 3:4 4:18

amplified 7:16

asserts 14:5

became 37:4 **become** 5:2 28:20 35:2 37:10 becomes 33:16 37:7 becoming 37:19 **begin** 6:14 26:11 beginning 35:22 behalf 23:20 24:13 **believe** 11:2 23:7 31:16 40:15 believed 39:18 Bell 22:1 Bellick 28:16,24 bench 9:25 16:6,13 17:7 21:2,10 22:11 25:6,19 32:10 33:18 34:3 38:7 benefit 5:6 15:21 38:8 43:4 best 19:7 33:19 **beyond** 23:23 **bit** 12:11 16:10 **bitter** 17:12 blaming 10:3 36:21 **body** 7:12 17:1 29:17 **Bonnie** 26:17 bottom 25:24 **bounce** 36:17 **Bradford** 3:4 4:18 Bradley 2:19 brief 38:2,3 briefing 15:7 37:1 briefs 5:10,12 6:9 7:3 36:25 37:6 **bring** 19:1 **bringing** 7:12,13 broad 16:5 32:3 34:9 brought 30:25 brush 32:3

18:10 19:6 28:1 31:14 С 35:17,21 38:1,4,9,15 **CA** 1:23 2:20 cause 8:17 10:11,12,13 California 1:1,15 2:23 **CCP** 32:17 5:4 17:25 18:7,9 19:8 **censure** 14:9 36:12,14 20:4 21:13,18 22:20 24:7 27:2 censured 6:17 31:14,15,17,19 41:9 **certain** 14:11 18:22 44:4,15 19:24 21:18 California's 18:11 certainly 33:24 34:19 20:11 23:11 CERTIFICATE 44:1 campaign 10:14 21:25 22:2,18 24:12,23,24 Certified 44:3 29:21 33:2,3,6 certify 44:4 34:14,15,17,20 Chair 16:21 32:15 35:19,24 37:17,21 38:11,17 39:25 Chairperson 2:4 4:9 40:13,20 42:20 5:23 campaigned 41:24 challenge 17:17 campaigning 32:25 33:5 challenged 17:7 41:7,9,12 42:9 characterize 29:12 campaign-related 25:18 characterized 29:16 42:13 **charged** 40:24 41:6 campaigns 23:11 **charges** 7:11,12 candidacy 9:4,12,21 9:3,8,16 18:19 33:17 34:25 15:9,14,17,19 17:13 37:14,23 Charlotte 1:20 44:3,14 candidate 20:9 23:22 33:8,9,10,11,12,16,20 **CHI** 32:5,6,8,11,12 34:4,6,21,22 Chief 18:13 19:25 21:15 35:2,4,5,7 40:16,19 37:4,7,10,13,16,20,22 41:2,4 children 32:21 candidates 18:2 **CJP** 1:6 canon 6:2,7 21:19 **claim** 13:9 33:6,19 Clark 27:9,12 34:14,19,20,22 38:5 28:11,14,23 40:24 42:4 **clear** 6:16 10:6 17:6,20 canons 21:19,21 27:4 21:12 38:12 41:8 31:16 33:11,15 34:13 **clearly** 7:4 9:16 36:4 39:7,8,17 40:22 13:12,13 27:11 37:2 41:25 43:2 38:6,14,19 39:22 Capozzi 2:6 9:1,2,11,19 40:11,25 41:18 42:3,7 10:2,5,16,23 11:4 **cling** 8:21 21:6,7 22:4 **close** 29:5 case 5:22 6:1 7:8 8:13

9:4 11:8 14:12 17:23

closed 4:22 closely 11:16 **clothes** 12:9,11,15 Code 20:11 33:15 34:16 35:1 colleagues 20:19 comes 38:7,10,13 40:2 **comment** 12:5,9 comments 25:17 **Commission** 1:2,14 2:3 4:3,9,10,11,16,20,22 5:1,7,15 6:17 7:3,7,19 11:12 14:12,24 15:15 16:1 17:14 29:16,18,22,24 30:3 32:1,4,6,14 36:11,25 38:3,12 41:24 42:19 43:13 Commissioner 4:6 5:11,25 8:25 9:2,11,19 10:2,5,16,23 11:4 13:16,18,20 14:10 15:5 16:18,24 20:13,16 21:4,6,7 22:4,5,6,8 23:3,7,12,19 24:2,10,16,17 25:5,9,14,16,23 26:1 27:5,6,8,11,20,24 29:7,9,11 30:13,17,19 31:20 33:23,25 34:24 35:3,10,11 36:16 42:10,11 43:3,10 **Commission's** 4:23 5:4 7:7 **committed** 15:2,15,24 **committee** 20:5 24:12 communicating 18:23 **compared** 31:15 39:8 compares 39:7 **completely** 38:4 41:22 concerned 31:1 **concerning** 1:5 4:4,8

concluded 4:21 39:9 **conclusion** 11:24 18:15 conclusions 13:3 conditional 37:18 conduct 6:21 9:9,22 10:11,23 15:20 16:2,3,16 20:20,21,25 29:25 36:3,4 38:20 39:18 41:17,19 42:13,14,16 **Conger** 24:19 38:19 41:20,21 Conger's 42:6 connection 32:25 consider 9:19 13:24 14:18 15:8 considered 25:19 31:4 consistent 16:12 **Constitution** 18:9 26:8 33:14 37:5 Constitutional 19:11 consult 21:24 contact 23:1 contempt 36:9 contested 17:7 context 25:16 continued 8:12 continuously 15:1 contributions 23:8 41:3 controlling 24:5 **correct** 11:13 22:16 23:3 24:10,11,25 25:7,11,21,22 34:25 **correctly** 33:15 34:8 corrupted 28:20 counsel 2:16 3:2,3,4,5 4:14,17 5:6 counsels 4:17 count 6:4,5,13 10:20,21 11:20,21 13:4 15:11,21,22 42:21

43:5,6 counts 9:18 10:17 11:11 14:1 15:10 21:10 30:19,24 37:11 county 2:24 4:13 17:10,18 19:14 21:2 22:25 23:1,2 27:23 41:10 couple 11:19 33:21 course 6:9 39:7 court 2:23 4:14 5:4 8:20 17:22 20:19 23:16 28:12 31:13 courthouse 8:23 22:14,19,22 36:4,13 41:6,8 courtroom 43:14 Cowan 32:2,9 criticized 32:22 CSR 1:20 44:14 curious 27:8 **date** 26:8 44:8 Dato 2:7 22:5,6,8 23:3,7,12,19 24:2,10,16 33:23,25 34:24 35:3,10 Dave 28:16,24 day 12:4 26:10,21 35:16 41:11 44:10 days 5:2 9:4,12,13 29:24 30:10 38:23 42:24 **DE** 2:8 **deal** 17:2 dealing 19:5 dealt 28:9 **debt** 38:11 decide 31:2 **decided** 8:22 18:10 33:13 35:23 **decision** 4:23 5:2 15:15

19:12 26:15 31:17 37:3 **decisions** 19:2,4,5 31:13 36:11 **declaration** 18:18 33:17 37:14,23 41:16 declared 34:6 declaring 37:21 defended 35:17 **defense** 7:5 8:11 **define** 34:24 defined 33:10 defines 37:6 deliberate 4:22 Democrat 18:3 demonstrate 11:6 demonstrated 6:20 demonstrates 14:15 demonstration 14:21 denials 14:20 denies 15:1 describe 20:25 destroyed 25:4 **detail** 11:23 determination 5:5 14:13 determine 19:19 determined 33:16 **determining** 6:19 41:15 devices 32:8 **Diego** 19:15 23:2 different 15:2 22:15,18 42:24,25 difficult 20:18 28:13 directly 23:15 34:19 disagree 22:9 34:1 disagreeing 10:16 disagreement 24:4 disagrees 11:13

disappointed 30:24 disappoints 30:21 discharging 36:8 **discipline** 6:15,20 14:3 36:14 **disclose** 27:15,25 28:2,4 disclosure 29:5 **discovery** 28:15,18 discussion 28:21 discussions 19:16 dishonest 7:14 dispute 28:14 disqualified 32:18 distant 26:4 **distribute** 24:21 25:4 district 26:16 dividing 34:2 document 18:19 dollars 17:11 donations 35:6 40:12 **done** 16:4 22:13 29:10 32:14 41:17 **Dorado** 2:24 4:13 8:20 17:10 21:2 22:25 23:1 27:23 41:10 **DR** 2:11 **drafted** 12:1,3 draw 9:10 **dress** 12:18 Dumanis 26:17 during 4:12 9:22 **duties** 36:5,9 E earlier 20:17 **early** 30:8

egregious 16:14 **eight** 16:6 31:22 eight-year 15:25 either 14:24 20:6 26:23 **El** 2:24 4:13 8:20 17:10 21:2 22:25 23:1 27:23 41:10 elected 19:21 election 37:8 **elections** 17:8,9,14,15 20:11 33:15 34:16 35:1 eligible 37:8 **else** 36:10 **else's** 20:20 **email** 12:1 E-mail 1:24 **emails** 24:23 embarked 38:16 encourage 31:5 engage 22:10 34:13 35:23 38:19 39:18 engaged 16:7,13 38:20 41:18 engaging 33:3,5 **ensure** 22:22 entire 7:20 environment 10:9,11 **equivalent** 7:11 9:15 **ERICA** 2:14 **ESQ** 2:4,6,17,18 3:2,3,4 **essentially** 6:3,8 7:6 8:22 11:6 establishing 34:17 estimation 39:9 ethical 21:8 23:13,15 27:25 ethics 21:9,11 24:20 32:11 **eventually** 8:14 38:20

EDDIE 2:8

EDUARDO 2:8

Everson 2:18 4:15 everyone 37:13 everything 32:13 **evidence** 7:21 11:25 41:18 evidentiary 5:8 **exact** 17:22 **exactly** 40:17 examine 11:16**examiner** 5:16,22 6:16 26:5 **examiners** 3:1 4:16 6:1,10 examining 39:17 **example** 10:20 11:20 13:25 15:11 26:17 exception 6:4 **excerpt** 7:18,22 8:5 **excerpts** 12:7 13:5 Excuse 8:25 **excuses** 20:20,25 **exercise** 13:23 14:5 **exhibit** 8:2,3,8,9 11:25 12:1,7 13:12 36:19 **exhibits** 36:18 37:15 40:8,11 **exit** 43:13 expect 26:7 **expensive** 17:10,11 **expert** 24:19 explain 8:12 explained 37:5 exploratory 33:5 34:14,20 35:24 37:21 38:16 exploring 33:2 extensively 39:3 **extent** 6:20 15:8 20:20 22:10

F fact 9:19 13:2,3,14 22:1 24:4 fact-findings 6:2,7 10:20 factor 6:14 7:1 10:10 14:18 15:7 factors 6:18 14:12,14 41:14 facts 12:4,24 13:6 30:25 32:19 38:9 factual 13:8 failed 7:4 fair 20:10 32:19 34:16 fairness 36:7 falls 23:8,10 **false** 7:18 familiar 5:11 **fault** 14:23 **Fax** 1:25 February 9:21 44:10 federal 18:11 **feel** 27:15 28:2 **Feeney** 2:19 **felt** 8:18,20 **ferret** 28:13 **file** 8:4,10 9:21 20:8,12 26:21 29:24 30:9,10 33:17 **filed** 9:4,5,6,8,11 18:19 25:10,12 37:14 files 19:10 37:22 filing 29:24 34:7,25 35:7 **final** 5:2 19:12 Finally 41:14 finance 22:2 finding 12:20 14:4,9 31:6 42:12,19 findings 6:11

10:17,19,21 12:24 13:2,3,6,14,25 15:12 31:1 42:16,23 **firm** 22:1 **first** 5:17 6:14 7:24 10:17 14:8 16:3 19:4,6,7,23 23:25 25:20 31:9,25 35:16,25 37:24 38:14 **fit** 20:22 Five 13:16,17 flyer 25:2 **flyers** 24:21 foregoing 44:5 **forgive** 36:18 **form** 20:5 former 1:5 4:4,8 24:19 formerly 4:13 **forward** 26:16 Francisco 1:15,23 2:20 4:15 frankly 30:23 31:5 free 19:18 fresh 12:4 friends 27:11 friendship 27:21 28:5 front 22:23 fully 12:20,21 fund-raising 18:14 **funds** 33:7 future 6:21 G gay 11:21,22 12:3,14 13:7,13 gays 12:15,17 **general** 18:1,2 23:22 30:7 31:18,19 33:2,13 35:24 37:17 gentlemen 4:7

gets 9:8 15:21 getting 16:15 18:8 **gifts** 10:13 **given** 13:21 gives 18:22 26:8 **giving** 14:6 golfing 27:13 graph 16:11 **ground** 31:17 grouped 15:20 guess 13:20 29:23 guy 12:14 guys 29:22

Η **half** 16:7 17:11 **hand** 44:9 handbook 39:3 happen 9:5,13 13:15 18:2 happened 18:3 happens 12:25 Harper 2:5 27:6,8,11,20,24 29:9 having 19:22,23 28:9 heard 5:16 12:3,4 13:11 hearing 12:23,25 13:1 37:2 heat 29:23 height 29:21 hereby 44:4 hereunto 44:9 he's 9:9,25 11:12 12:9 13:15 14:23 16:12,13 32:1,22 37:15,16,19,21 38:23 39:1,19 40:4,10,11,17 41:12 42:3,8 43:1,4

high 16:9 40:5 higher 14:3

highlight 6:12,25 Hiltachk 22:2 hired 22:1 history 19:8 **HON** 2:5,7,14 honesty 36:8 Honor 9:14 16:20 29:8 **HONORABLE** 2:23 hostility 17:6 hour 5:13 28:1 hours 7:25 8:1,6,7 hyperspeed 30:5

identified 6:18 ignores 38:4 I'11 39:4 I'm 4:8 5:22 6:8,23 7:21,24 10:1 11:18 12:6,16,21 13:4,23 14:5,19,25 15:6 19:7 20:16,24,25 27:8 29:10,20 30:10,13,23 31:1 32:1 35:9 36:17,19 37:19,20,25 39:12 40:18 42:15 43:8 immediately 30:6 impact 6:22 26:15 31:7 impartial 32:19

important 26:3,6 impose 14:3 impression 19:6 37:24 38:14 improper 11:1 improprieties 11:18 impropriety 7:4 14:22 improving 16:16 **INC** 1:22

impartiality 36:7

include 32:19 including 24:21 indicate 10:8 indicated 7:8 14:11 15:9 41:5 indicating 23:20,21 indifferent 31:8 individual 18:4 29:3 individuals 12:2 individual's 20:25 inference 9:10 info@UccelliAssociates. com 1:24informal 27:17,20 informing 34:15 initial 7:6 8:11 16:22 17:13 35:20 initiated 27:12 inquired 8:19 inquiry 1:5 4:4,8 intent 9:12 intention 20:9 25:10,12 intentionally 41:17,19 42:8 interest 38:6 interested 39:11,12 interesting 38:2 39:19 interrupt 20:16 interview 7:20 32:2 investigation 9:7 35:20 **involve** 36:12 involved 39:9 43:1 involving 35:15 36:4 **isn't** 24:18 26:7 issue 17:3,24 23:15 27:9 28:21 31:2 32:15,20,22,23 36:9

37:24 38:14

issued 5:3 35:20

issues 5:12 23:13 28:13 judicial 1:2 3:6 4:3 **least** 19:8 23:20 35:19,25 6:22 18:12,13 20:6 **leave** 24:25 25:6 24:19,22 25:2 33:11 it's 7:20 8:1 10:23 26:9,10 34:3 38:10 36:6,9 40:20 11:9 12:1,14 41:11 13:6,12,13 **Julie** 24:19 **legal** 31:16 38:22 14:20,22,24,25 15:22 jumped 26:14 legislature's 24:7 16:18 18:20 22:13 jurisdictions 41:2 23:15,24 24:10 26:20 letters 30:2 27:2,3 31:10 32:20 **Justice** 19:25 21:15 letting 39:11 33:10 35:7,23 41:8 22:6 40:16,19 43:5 **level** 10:25 11:2 14:3 Justice's 18:13 18:11 29:3 42:17 I've 15:8 likelihood 6:21 limitations 34:7 **KASPARIAN** 2:10 30:19 **JAGER** 2:9 limited 11:9 Kingsbury 8:16,18 10:3 James 2:17 4:14 14:24 17:21 20:22 line 25:24 34:2 **Janet** 2:18 4:15 35:15,17 36:22 **list** 10:22 11:19 knew 27:22 28:8,23,24 **January** 1:17 4:1 28:15,18,25 40:9 29:1 42:3 **job** 36:5 listened 31:25 40:15,18 knowingly 41:17 42:7 judge 1:5 4:4,8,12 literally 22:21 33:20 Kreep 15:13,25 16:8 5:7,14 6:17 7:2,18 literature 24:24 43:6 8:16,17,18,19,21,23 litigation 28:11 11:6,11 12:8,20 **KRUER** 2:9 13:2,9,10 14:9,15,24 little 12:11 16:10 15:13,25 L **Lizarraga** 3:2 4:17 16:6,8,11,21,25 **LA** 2:8 5:18,21,22 6:1 8:5,11 17:8,16,18,19 9:3,6,14,24 18:19,21,24 19:3,7,10 **lack** 7:11 9:16,17 10:4,8,18,24 11:5 20:13,15,22,24 ladies 4:6 13:17 14:8,11 15:4,6 21:5,12,20 16:18,20 31:25 35:14 22:10,11,17 **Lake** 22:25 36:16,17 42:11,15 23:5,10,14,24 28:10,18,19,21 43:4 24:3,15,19 language 37:18 42:7 25:1,8,12,21,25 locations 42:25 last 19:8 26:3,13,16 long 8:19 22:13 34:5 27:6,10,17,22 28:6 lately 16:4 29:10,20 30:15,23 **Los** 19:14 **later** 9:13 30:9 31:7 32:3,4,10,18,19 **lot** 11:23 16:10 23:1 33:1,12 34:1,2,12 law 13:3 14:12 18:10 35:15,16,17,18,23 20:4 21:16,23,25 22:2 36:1,5,7,21,23 24:8 31:14 33:14 37:3,9,12 Mack 31:10 lawyer 28:9,22 38:2,7,8,9,19 Madam 5:23 16:21 32:15 39:2,23,24 lawyers **makeup** 29:16 41:2,10,12,18,20 42:6 28:9,16,17,19,25 38:21 40:16 mandated 20:3 judges 17:7 20:1,3 21:15 23:17 24:9 lays 24:6 manner 31:18 26:19 27:24 29:14 learning 16:16 Mark 3:2 4:17 5:22 31:3

master 27:14 masters 5:9,10 6:11 7:3 9:17 10:5,17 11:1,21 12:20,24 13:25 15:3,9 26:6 33:3 36:2 37:1 40:25 42:16 Mathias 1:20 44:3,14 matter 4:3,21 24:5 28:11 41:10 44:7 **matters** 32:12 may 4:11 5:18,24 18:5,20 26:16 McAndrews 22:2 mean 9:14,15,25 10:11 14:5 15:21 17:15 22:3 means 37:25 meet 4:22 member 4:10 members 2:3 4:10 5:7 7:7 16:1 43:13 men 11:23 13:7,13 mentioned 31:14 mentions 38:3 merit 7:11 9:16,17 Michael 2:5,11 27:6 million 17:11mind 12:4 minions 8:22 minute 43:3 minutes 5:14,20,23 6:23 7:23,25 8:1,6,7 13:16,17 15:4,5,6 16:23 29:7 31:22 35:12 misconduct 6:20,22 9:25 10:25 11:3,7 12:21 14:1,4,9,16 15:8,16,23 16:8,9,11,14 25:19 30:20 36:12 42:17,23 43:6

mislead 32:1 Mission 1:23 misusing 32:9 mitigating 10:10 monetary 40:12 money 19:25 20:2,5 21:9,14,16,20 23:4,8,18 34:17 37:16 40:16,19,23 months 30:1,9 37:22 **MOODIAN** 2:11 motivated 7:9 32:14 multiple 15:10,17,24 multiple-fold 17:5 Murphy 2:17,19 4:15 16:21 31:21,23 33:24 34:9 35:1,9,11,13 36:21 37:9 myself 17:8,16 mystery 17:25 19:15 N Nanci 2:4 4:9

narrow 31:6,7 **nasty** 17:12,15 **nature** 17:3,4 19:17 21:1 28:11 29:13 necessarily 41:7 nefarious 9:9 **nice** 12:14,15 Nishimura 2:4 4:6,9 5:25 8:25 13:16,18 15:5 16:18,24 20:13 21:6 22:6 24:17 25:5,9,14 27:6 29:7,11 30:13,17 31:20 35:11 36:16 42:10 43:3,10 nominated 18:5,6 **none** 35:6 36:3 nonjudicial 18:12,16,25 20:6 31:3 33:8,9,21 34:4,23 38:11

40:20,23 41:4 normally 21:22 **notes** 44:6 **nothing** 30:1 37:6 39:23 40:1,22 **notice** 9:8 11:11 15:19 25:12 41:21 noticeable 36:1 November 24:18 25:10 oath 38:23 39:16 40:4 **object** 42:18 objected 42:18 objections 6:10,12 10:24 objective 32:18 **obligation** 27:25 28:4 34:15 obtained 32:11 **obviously** 14:19,25 28:23 occurring 30:1 odd 12:11 odds 35:18 offered 7:5 **office** 3:5 10:15 18:12,16,25 19:11,17,20,21 26:11 31:3 33:1,11,21 34:5,23 38:11 39:25 40:21,23 officially 34:6 **oh** 12:10 26:13 30:18 Okay 14:8 21:4 23:3,12,19 24:2,16 35:10 **old** 30:1 opening 29:12 31:11 38:2 opinion 21:8,9,11 28:19

misdeeds 11:14

32:11

opinions 39:12 opportunity 16:25 **opposed** 17:18 **opposite** 16:12 17:9 optic 32:20 oral 1:14 4:19 5:13 Orange 19:15 23:2 order 15:15 43:13 organization 33:8 organizational 15:20 42:20 others 26:25 otherwise 4:11 14:4 ought 13:24 14:2 19:12 outside 28:17,22 P

p.m 4:1 43:16 page 13:4,6 39:1,5,21 **pages** 44:5 paper 14:20 Paris 12:13 PARTICIPANTS 2:1 participate 4:12 particular 11:24,25 19:5 26:10 28:21 29:3 particularly 23:16 parties 4:24 5:10 18:5 partisan 39:25 40:20 **party** 18:4 Pattyl 2:10 30:18 Pearson 2:19 **people** 19:13,14 22:20,23 23:2,20 24:12 26:18,24 31:8 35:4 38:18 39:11 40:8,10 perceive 30:11

perception 32:16,20,22 **performance** 1:2 3:6 4:3 36:5 **period** 9:22 15:25 permission 26:9 permissive 18:18,20 **permitted** 21:16 27:2 39:14 perpetuates 13:11 person 32:18 33:16 personal 32:10 38:6 40:25 personally 32:7 33:6,7 41:3 perspective 31:12 petition 5:3 Phil 32:2 photograph 24:21 **picked** 12:17 picture 16:5 Placerville 28:17,25 planned 9:5 planning 22:12 23:9,23 **play** 7:17,22 14:18 played 32:2 **Playing** 8:4,10 please 4:5 5:11,18 43:12 point 26:4 28:6 29:4,25 32:24 38:1,5 points 31:23 33:22 35:13 **policy** 41:16 political 7:13 13:22 14:5 17:3,4,22 18:5 20:10 23:25 24:1 29:13,15,18,21 30:12,16 33:1,8 34:16 35:19,25 39:25 **politically** 7:8 32:14

politics 17:24 **position** 17:21 19:25 22:16,18 32:9 positions 30:21 possibility 19:20 possible 22:22 36:20 potentially 37:20 **power** 36:6 practice 22:3 practiced 28:25 Practices 20:10 34:16 pre-bench 16:3 predicament 8:12 preference 18:4 preferences 18:4 prejudicial 42:14,17,22 preliminary 35:20 premises 41:6 present 4:10,14 presentation 5:16 16:22 presented 5:12 president 27:18 presiding 8:19,21 17:8,16,19 pretty 10:6 prior 6:20 12:23 18:8 20:4 22:11 25:18 private 7:9,16 19:17 22:12 23:9,23 probability 19:20 probably 19:8 28:7 problem 32:21 problems 8:17 proceed 5:18,24 proceedings 4:7,12 17:3 43:15 44:8 process 18:8,12,16 19:22 21:13 profit 32:10

perceived 32:5

profiting 32:7 prohibit 21:17 prohibited 20:1 27:3 42:1 prohibiting 33:7 prohibition 21:20,22 prolonged 9:7 **promote** 39:24 proper 18:15 25:3 propose 13:1 proposed 12:23 13:3,6,14 public 4:7,25 7:16 21:25 23:5 26:11 36:15 publicly 7:10 purported 29:15 purposes 15:20 42:20 pursuant 4:20 5:1 question 9:1,2 10:2,23 13:19 20:14 22:5,7 24:17 25:14 27:7 29:11 30:14,18 32:5 33:4,6,23,25 34:21 36:6,8 questions 4:11 6:9 16:2

13:19 20:14 22:5,7
24:17 25:14 27:7
29:11 30:14,18 32:5
33:4,6,23,25 34:21
36:6,8

questions 4:11 6:9 16:2
31:22 43:8

quick 30:18 35:13

quickly 36:20 39:4

quite 17:9 30:8 34:9
40:18

quote 39:2

R
Rackauckas 26:17
radio 7:20
raise 19:25 20:5
21:8,14,16 23:18
40:16,23

raises 23:13 32:15 raising 20:1 21:20 23:4,8 32:22 40:19 ramps 16:13 ran 17:25 reading 12:6 13:5 39:15,17 real 17:24 realistic 26:20 realize 9:9 23:19 realized 19:22 really 11:16,17 12:17 17:4 31:3 37:25 reason 19:1 23:16 26:5,6 43:7 reasonable 26:7 reasons 7:13 29:19 rebuttal 5:20 recall 11:20 16:1 received 5:8 recognize 7:4 11:7 record 5:12 17:5,20 19:13 20:23 23:6 24:11 **refer** 35:4,5 **referee** 28:18 referees 28:15 reference 34:25 referrals 32:7 referred 29:15 32:12 referring 12:9 reflects 19:14 regard 22:9 34:2 regarding 36:8 regards 6:6,13 38:5 registered 18:6 rejected 41:23 relating 24:23 32:5

27:16,18,20 29:5 relationships 20:18 relevant 6:19 relinquish 31:21 **rely** 15:7 21:22 **remain** 43:12 remained 18:24 remark 11:21,22 12:3,19 13:10 remarks 10:12 11:22 13:13 29:12 remotely 40:1 **remove** 24:22 repeating 7:17 **reply** 38:2 report 5:9 10:5 REPORTED 1:20 Reporter 44:1,4 REPORTER'S 1:13 representing 35:16 36:22 Republican 18:3 request 6:6 16:22 18:20,21 requested 6:2 **requesting** 6:16 40:12 requests 6:3 require 29:5 required 21:17 34:15 requirements 20:7 requires 20:4 26:8 research 39:2 40:3 researched 33:14 **reserve** 5:19,23 resigning 25:18 resources 17:22 respect 24:12 35:19 Respectfully 24:3

relationship 21:1

respondent 2:22 4:12 sick 41:11 S 5:3 **sides** 5:6 13:1 17:9 **safe** 28:7 RESPONDENT'S 2:16 significant 17:6,15 **San** 1:15,23 2:20 4:15 response 12:12 28:12 41:13 19:15 23:2 **similar** 15:20 41:1 **responses** 7:2 11:12 **sanction** 6:19 14:14 36:25 **simply** 20:10 41:16 responsibility 14:16 Simpson 2:12 13:19,20 **SARAH** 2:9 restricted 42:4 14:10 25:15,16,23 scapegoat 14:23 26:1 27:5 42:10,11 restrictions 24:8 scheduled 5:13 single 6:11,24 11:11 retaliate 29:18 **scheme** 23:11,17 24:6 singles 24:9 retaliation 29:13 27:3 31:15 **sir** 8:25 13:18 retire 30:4 38:11 **SCRAM** 32:7 **sitting** 17:17,18 18:24 retired 9:20,23 30:6 **seated** 4:5 43:12 19:7,18 21:10,20 33:18 secondly 19:24 22:10 23:17 26:19 retribution 17:22 38:7 39:23 41:9,12 **seconds** 7:25 8:1,6,7 **review** 5:4 33:15 six 30:1,8,9 38:15 **section** 18:17 32:17 reviewed 18:9,13 39:6 skepticism 40:6 39:21 41:25 **solicit** 35:6 41:3 **seem** 22:15 34:5 Richard 2:12 13:19 **seemed** 21:16 solicitation 41:1 25:15 42:10 soliciting 23:8 33:7 segment 7:24 **rights** 18:22 34:17 Sei 3:3 4:18 rise 4:2 11:2 29:2 **solid** 31:16 self-awareness 11:7 **RIVA** 2:8 **somebody** 12:9 37:7 September 30:8 Riverside 23:2 somebody's 19:17 serious 16:14 **Road** 1:23 **somehow** 32:13 served 4:24 **robe** 24:22 25:3 **someone** 20:20 23:15 **session** 4:5,22 rose 42:16 somewhere 12:13 **sets** 17:13 Rothman 22:11 34:2,11 **sorry** 10:1 13:4 20:16 39:15,17,20,22,23 setting 20:19 **sort** 8:12 13:22 16:5 Rothman's 22:9 39:3 **several** 6:2,10,18 7:17 40:7 15:10 roughly 27:18 30:8 **sought** 24:18 **share** 34:12 **RPR** 1:20 44:14 **sounds** 30:11,15 sharing 14:6 **Rule** 4:20 5:1 **South** 1:23 22:25 She's 12:8 rules 5:1 36:4 28:10,17,19,21 **Shimoguchi** 3:3 4:18 run 26:11,16,19 27:1 Southern 22:20 30:7 31:9,17,18 33:13 **shirt** 12:14 **speak** 17:1 **running** 17:10 Shorthand 44:3 special 5:9 9:17 27:14 18:12,16,24 19:20 **shown** 20:23 33:3 36:2 37:1 42:16 31:3 39:12 **shows** 14:17 specific 18:19

runs 19:10

specifically 17:2 18:17 speeches 33:9 **spoke** 38:18 40:14 41:20 **staff** 8:22 17:21 29:22,24 30:3 standards 17:10 **start** 6:25 7:24,25 started 8:14 16:8,9,10 **state** 1:1 10:14 18:9,11 19:10 21:23 37:13 44:4,15 **statement** 13:7,9 20:8 34:25 35:7 states 31:13 38:6 statewide 19:11 **statute** 18:20 21:13 24:5,6 34:17 statutes 21:18 **statutory** 23:11,17 24:6 27:3 31:15 stenographic 44:6 **steps** 21:18 24:13 stereotype 13:9 stereotypes 13:11 stereotyping 10:12 11:22 13:12 Steve 4:8 Steven 1:5 2:23 4:4,13 subcounts 42:23 submission 43:11 **submissions** 8:13 12:22 36:24 **submit** 6:8 33:19 36:14 43:9 submitted 4:21 subparts 15:10,11,17 42:21 **sudden** 26:10 30:4 suggest 26:14 **suggested** 26:24,25

suggesting 13:21,23,24 25:21 26:3,6 28:14 32:8,21 34:9,22 14:2 20:24 29:17,20 35:1,9,21 36:1 38:1 Superior 2:23 4:14 8:20 39:3 41:12 **support** 19:24 26:23 theories 7:5 11:5,9 31:8,9 39:13 theory 8:12,15,16 10:3 supported 17:19 32:13 35:14,17,21,22 supposed 10:13 41:15,21 36:22 37:2 **Supreme** 5:4 31:13 Therefore 15:22 **sure** 13:23 20:15 there's 9:9 10:24 25:23,25 27:10 32:1 13:8,18 17:25 21:21 37:25 40:18 25:14 36:6 37:18,25 39:22,25 40:22 41:18 **surprised** 30:20,24 they're 6:7 7:12 38:21 sustained 9:17 42:24,25 15:3,9,14 third-party 23:25 Suzanne 12:2 17:21 threaten 8:21 system 6:22 threatened 8:18 throughout 8:23 10:14 **Tahoe** 22:25 41:9 28:10,18,20,22,23 Thurman 12:2 tailor 11:21 12:3 title 8:22 10:14 23:21 taking 20:17 28:12 24:14,22,24 37:15 38:5,8,10 39:24 41:23 talk 19:13 22:20 42:8 talked 19:14 20:17 today 12:10 17:1 19:2 26:24 40:16 **TORRES** 2:13 talking 19:18 26:21 touched 40:7 32:13 34:11 39:10 40:8,10,19 towards 16:12 talks 22:12 32:10 37:7 toxic 10:8,9,10 **Tel** 1:25 trailing 16:9,10 ten 15:4 transcript 1:13 5:8 7:21 8:2,8 32:2,8 tenure 16:13,15 terms 18:23 34:4 transcription 44:6 **testified** 38:20,23 treasurer 20:8 testimony 38:22,25 treatise 22:9 39:16 40:4 42:6 trial 3:2,3,4,5 4:16,17 Thank 11:4 16:20,25 39:16 21:4,5 22:4 26:1 27:5 truck 31:10 29:9 30:17 31:20 true 24:18 44:5 35:13 36:15 43:9 **try** 36:19 39:4 that's 8:8 11:13 12:19 21:2,24 22:3 23:5

trying 9:9 14:6

20:21,25 26:22 32:1 **types** 34:18 39:10,14 typo 13:8

IJ **UCCELLI** 1:22

ultimately 22:1 31:2 unconstitutional 42:1,5

uncontested 6:3,8

uncover 8:23

understand 11:14 13:21 14:6,10 20:18 22:8 24:3 26:1,4 28:3 34:7

understanding 24:11

understands 14:17

understood 41:25

unfair 42:4

United 31:13

unless 6:9 23:14,15

unlike 15:25 16:8

unwilling 14:22

urged 24:22

vacation 22:21

vague 39:19 40:17

various 10:24 41:22

versed 21:25

VICE-CHAIRPERSON 2:5

video 18:13 20:1 21:15 40:15

view 23:23 25:19 34:12 35:3

viewed 32:4 40:5

violate 34:13,20

violating 43:1

violation 36:3

violations 6:3,7

voter-nominated 18:1

voters 18:6,23

W **waited** 26:20

waiting 31:10

wasn't 10:13

wearing 12:16

wedding 27:12

Wednesday 1:17 4:1

weekend 22:21

weight 13:21 14:7

welcome 5:15

We'll 43:10

we're 18:5 32:12

WHEREOF 44:9

Whereupon 43:15

whether 14:15,16

19:2,19 21:8 25:1,2

26:22 33:5 39:13

41:16

whole 12:17 16:10

whose 18:3

willful 14:1,4,9 36:12

42:13

WILLIAM 2:7

willing 39:13

wish 26:16

WITNESS 44:9

working 24:13 35:5

Wow 13:17

writing 4:23

writings 11:17

written 27:4

wrong 11:15 14:17

www.UccelliAssociates.c

om 1:24

yet 15:14 34:5 37:14 41:22

Yew 2:14 20:13,16 21:4

you'll 11:11

yourself 35:4,5

Zellerbach 26:18 38:1,3,9,15